

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given the present application. The application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action, and amended as necessary to more clearly and particularly describe the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

The Examiner rejected claims 4 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Lee et al., U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0066729. Lee does not teach all the limitations of amended claim 4. More specifically, Lee does not teach “wherein loss of voltage from the commercial power supply is determined if a state where the detection value of the input current detector is lower than a target value by a predetermined difference is continued for a given time, the controller stops the high-frequency inverter.” Referring to Figure 1 and to paragraphs [0029] and [0030] of Lee, Lee discloses a low voltage detector part that measures the incoming voltage. If the incoming voltage is lower than a predetermined lower limit then the controller part interrupts the incoming power. Lee also discloses a current detector part. But the current detector interrupts power if the current into the transformer exceeds an allowable current value. Hence, the current detector is for overload protection. Thus, the low voltage detector part in Lee is for detecting a loss of power and the current detector part is used for detecting a current overload. Thus, Lee does not teach “wherein loss of voltage from the commercial power supply is determined if a state where the detection value of the input current detector is lower than a target value by a predetermined difference is continued for a given time, the controller stops the high-frequency inverter.” Therefore, Lee does not teach all the limitations of amended claim 4.

Claim 5 depends from claim 4, thus, all arguments pertaining to claim 4 are equally applicable to claim 5 and are herein incorporated by reference.

Appln. No. 10/625,266
Amdt. dated December 28, 2005
Reply to Final Office Action dated July 28, 2005

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in a condition for allowance and notice to that effect is hereby requested. If it is determined that the application is not in a condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to initiate a telephone interview with the undersigned attorney to expedite prosecution of the present application.

If there are any additional fees resulting from this communication, please charge same to our Deposit Account No. 16-0820, our Order No. 34698US1.

Respectfully submitted,

PEARNE & GORDON LLP

By: 

Michael W. Garvey – Reg. No. 35,878

1801 East 9th Street
Suite 1200
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-3108
(216) 579-1700

Date: December 28, 2005